DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 968 EA 006 585

AUTHOR Driggers, Preston F.
TITLE Synthetic Models of Organization: Towards a Preliminary Synthesis of the Literature.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at Midwest Sociological Society Annual Meeting. (28th, Omaha, Nebraska, April 3-6, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; Literature Reviews; *Models; *Organization; *Organizational Theories; *Organizations (Groups); Research; Theories; *Typology

ABSTRACT

The similarities between major organizational typologies have been noted in recent years, but thus far no one has shown how these typologies can be interpreted within a single theoretical framework. This paper aims to remedy this problem by illustrating how four major organizational typologies can be interpreted within a composite, four-fold, polythetic typology. The result of this theoretical scheme is the identification of four synthetic types of organizations (utilitarian, political, ideational, and solidary). This second stage typology -- a typology of typologies -- is further extended by using additional typologies drawn from the relevant organizational literature for defining salient characteristics of these four synthetic organizational types. The potential utilization of the synthetic organizational types for interorganizational analysis is then outlined. (Author)

ED 099668

PLEASE DO NOT CITE OR QUOTE
WITHOUT PERMISSION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Preston F. Driggers

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

SYNTHETIC MODELS OF ORGANIZATION: TOWARDS A PRELIMINARY SYNTHESIS OF THE LITERATURE

Preston F. Driggers
Department of Sociology
Colorado State University

EA 006 585

Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society, Session 28, "Organizations: Contemporary Research," Omaha, Nebraska, April 3-6, 1974.

The similarities between major organizational typologies have been noted in recent years (See: Burns, 1967; Hall, *et al.*, 1967; Weldon, 1972), but thus far no one has shown how these typologies can be interpreted within a single theoretical framework. This paper aims to remedy this problem by illustrating how four major organizational typologies (Parsons, 1956; Blau and Scott, 1962; Etzioni, 1961; and Thompson and Tuden, 1959 or Thompson, 1967:134-ff) can be interpreted within a composite, four fold, polythetic typology (Cf., Bailey, 1973). The result of this theoretical scheme is the identification of four synthetic types of organizations.[1] This second stage typology--a typology of typologies--is further extended by using additional typologies drawn from the relevant organizational literature for defining salient characteristics of these four synthetic organizational types. The potential utilization of the synthetic organizational types for inter-organizational analysis is then outlined.

A COMPOSITE TYPOLOGY

Tom Burns (1967:121) has previously pointed out that the Blau and Scott's typology of complex organizations based on prime beneficiary is a variant of Parsons' (1956) typology of organizations classified on their functional contribution to societal integration. Litterer (1973:63) develops a four fold table for the Blau and Scott typology by dychotomizing type of ownership into "close" and "general" categories and type of benefits into "intrinsic" and "extrinsic." Figure 1 combines the suggestions of these theorists into a preliminary composite typology.[2]

Etzioni's well known tripart typology of organizations is constructed around the type of compliance structure used by an organization to control

the lower participants. Utilitarian organizations, as represented by blue and white collar industries, and coercive organizations including prisons, custodial mental hospitals, and concentration camps readily fit with the other two typologies in the form of Type A and Type B organizations.[3] (See Figure 1.) The problem in trying to adapt Etzioni's scheme to the previous typologies is found in the lumping of all normative organizations into a single category. The difficulty with this approach is that some normative organizations are less normative than others (p. 51). Etzioni handles this difficulty by developing notions of primary and secondary compliance structures as well as dual compliance structures. Such techniques serve effectively to protect the tripart typology.

An alternative solution is to divide the group of normative organizations into: (1) those concerned with the establishment and/or maintenace of traditional norms, and (2) those concerned with enacted norms (Cf., Blake and Davis, 1964:465). Normative organizations$_1$ would be represented by religious organizations, ideological political organizations, and "core" social movement organizations. Normative organizations$_2$ would consist of professional organizations, schools, therapeutic mental hospitals, etc. (Cf., Etzioni:40-41). The immediate advantage of this single distinction is that it provides an expanded basis for synthesizing the organizational literature. (See Figure 2.)

The type of decision strategy used by an organization is the criterion for Thompson and Tuden's typology of organizations. This typology is essentially a "means-ends" distinction in which means are defined as "beliefs about cause/effect relations" and ends are defined as "outcome preferences." Each dimension is dychotomized into "certain" and "uncertain" categories providing four distinct decision strategies: computational, compromise, judgmental, and inspirational.

When means and ends are both certain, computational strategy is appropriate. Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy is seen as the organizational structure most

suitable for this type of strategy (1959:199). On the other hand, compromise strategy is best when there is some certainty with respect to the means but uncertainty regarding the outcomes. Examples here include decisions occurring within the United Nations Security Council, the American Congress, and trial juries (1959:200). The computational and compromise strategy organizations fit the preliminary composite typology in the form of Type A and Type B organizations.

The remaining two strategies represent situations in which there is uncertainty with regard to the outcomes or ends. Judgmental decision strategy is seen as most suitable for self-governing voluntary groups, collegiums (1959:200), and therapeutic hospital organizations (1967:137). This type of decision strategy involves wide-spread membership participation in the decision process, majority rule, and relatively equal influence.

Inspirational strategy, for the authors, occurs when there is uncertainty with respect to both means and ends. This is the type of strategy resulting from charismatic leadership (1959:202). On the surface, both of these latter two types of organizations also appear to fit the preliminary composite typology in the form of Type C and Type D organizations. The problem, however, is that these latter two types of organizations as illustrated in the Thompson and Tuden's typology (1959:204 or 1967:134) are shown as mirror reversals of what would be predicted on the basis of the three previously discussed typologies. The question needing an answer is to explain why half of their typology is consistent with the three earlier typologies and half is a mirror reversal.

The problem seems to arise from a misunderstanding of the nature of organizations having charismatic leadership. In the social movements literature it has long been recognized that charismatic leadership involves ends or outcomes which are defined with certainty and which are not open to questioning by the

membership (See: Bittner, 1969). In other words, inspirational decision strategy does not involve uncertainty with reference to the ends as Thompson and Tuden have suggested, but instead there is an ideologically defined certainty of mission or outcome, the acceptance of which is a *quid pro quo* of organizational membership.

Judgmental decision strategy, as illustrated by decision-making in American universities, seems to be more closely associated with uncertainty of both means and ends. Thompson notes that organizational conflicts can result when multiple professional groups enter into the decision process and he points to the uneasiness which exists in "research organizations, hospitals, universities, social welfare agencies, and schools" (1967:139). Interestingly, Thompson suggests that all of these organizations involve judgmental strategy. A stronger argument would be to contend that it is judgmental decision strategy which arises when there is uncertainty with respect to means and ends. This strategy results, in part, from the differential professional orientations of the participants towards the organizational cause/effect relations and outcomes.[4]

On the basis of this revised interpretation of inspirational and judgmental decision strategies, the Thompson and Tuden typology is also congruent with the three previous organizational typologies. Figure 2 shows all four typologies within a single composite typology of organizations. The four synthetic organizational types are labelled: Utilitarian (Type A), Political (Type B), Ideational (Type C), and Solidary (Type D) organizations. In the next section some of the salient dimensions of these synthetic organizations are discussed.

SELECTED DIMENSIONS OF THE SYNTHETIC ORGANIZATIONS

In this section of the paper the theoretical use of the typologies is reversed. That is, the criteria used by the theorists in developing their respective typologies are now focused upon as establishing an initial set of

dimensions for specifying the four synthetic organizations. (See Figure 3.)

Clark and Wilson (1961) propose a typology of organizational incentives. Utilitary organizations (Type A) use monetary and material incentives for motivating participants while solidary organizations (Type D) rely on social rewards, e.g., status, socializing, sense of group membership, etc. Purposive organizations (Type C) create incentives which are derived from the purpose or mission of the organization. Although the authors do not discuss negative sanctions, Heydebrand (1973:26) adds the suggestion that coercion and the fear of punishment is also a means for insuring compliance and this fits Etzioni's coercive organizations (Type B).

Closely related to organizational incentives is the notion of social power. Baldridge (1971:154-ff.) draws upon the relevant small group and organizational literatures for developing a four-fold typology of social power. A bureaucratic base of power refers to the formal structural arrangements which allow officials to have legitimate power over others within the organization. Coercive power derives from the use of force or threat of force to gain compliance and personal power arises from unique qualities of key individuals as they exert their influences on organizational decision-making. Finally, professional power is based "on the authority of expert knowledge" (p. 156). For present purposes, each of these four bases of social power is seen as a modal dimension for the respective synthetic organizations.

Similarly, Gamson (1968:111-ff. cited in Baldridge:165) suggests four types of social control tactics which are used by organizations. These tactics include (1) cooptation or providing positions in the authority structure for leaders of dissent factions, (2) use of "sanctions" or force to control dissents,

(3) insulation or separation of the competing groups, and (4) persuasion or the attempt to convince others of their unreasonableness.[5] Aldrich (1971) has hypothesized that the type of social control tactics[6] used by an organization is closely related to the organizational compliance structure. Cooptation is likely to be used by utilitarian organizations as a tactic to "buy off" dissent group leaders. Ideational organizations are likely to insulate their membership from organizations with competing ideologies, and solidary organizations, it is hypothesized, will tend to use persuasion as a social control tactic. Political organizations (Type B) are likely to use force or negative sanctions against conflict groups.[7]

Braybrooke and Lindblom (1963) have constructed a four part typology of planning or decision-making strategies. The rational-comprehensive type of planning requires complete knowledge about the means and ends of social action and is useful in highly technical and purely administrative decision-making. This is comparable to Thompson's computational decision strategy discussed earlier and as such is appropriate to utilitarian (Type A) organizations.

The second strategy refers to political decisions made at the highest level and designed to achieve large scale changes including revolutionary and utopian ends. The authors illustrate this type of decision-making by the example of the "decision of the Southern states to secede from the Union and the decision of the Lincoln administration to use force to stop them" (p. 67).

A third type of planning strategy involves the creation of "grand opportunities" by wars and revolutions. The key distinction between these last two types of strategies is that the former represents singular, but very broad reaching decisions made by the highest legitimate political elite. The latter strategy occurs under conditions of crises, revolutions, and war.

Finally, the last type of planning strategy, disjointed incrementalism, (the authors' preferred strategy) refers to the condition in which planning decisions are continually being adjusted or incremented without regard for the need of consensually defined end(s).

Weber (1947) has discussed four very similar types of decision bases (See: Meeker, 1971). Weber's "rational calculation of means and ends" is identical to Braybrooke and Lindblom's rational comprehensive planning. Weber's second type of decision base arises from the traditional authority of the chief. To the degree to which such decisions are designed to create major changes in the social system and are made by the highest political elite(s), then Weber's second decision base approximates Braybrooke and Lindblom's large scale political planning.[8]

Emotion as a decision base is defined by Weber in terms of the affective orientation of the actor (1947:115) and is suggestive of the type of decisions associated with ideational organizations (Type C), and as such, closely approximates Braybrooke and Lindblom's "grand opportunities" type of planning. Thompson's inspirational decision strategy as discussed earlier also fits here.

Finally, Weber discusses a type of decision making in which means are evaluated without regard to ends. This is essentially Braybrooke and Lindblom's disjointed incrementalism, and compare's favorably with Thompson's judgmental decision strategy as discussed above. In the present context, these planning and decision strategies are seen as the modal types for solidary organizations.

Friedmann's (1967) four ideal types of planning behaviors are highly congruent with the above discussions. The four fold typology (Krueckeberg, 1971: 201) is constructed by cross-tabulating two planning dimensions. The first dimension ranges from adaptive to developmental planning and is essentially representative of the degree of autonomy decision makers have in choosing means

and ends. The second dimension ranges from allocative to innovative planning and underscores the degree of social change resulting from the planning activity.

Adaptive-allocation planning is associated with short-range, budget-oriented planning and as such, closely resembles Thompson's computational decision strategy. Developmental-allocation planning is similar to Thompson's compromise decision strategy. For Friedmann, this type of planning revolves around high autonomy in setting ends and choosing means and then the assignment of resources among the competing means--hence, the compromise feature of this type of planning.

Adaptive-innovation planning parallels Thompson's inspirational decision strategy. This is opportunistic planning in which most decisions are contingent upon the actions external to the planning system. This would seem to include both the actions of other groups as well as teleological features of organizational ideologies. The innovative aspect refers to the desire to produce major changes in the existing social system. Interpreted here, adaptive-innovation planning behavior is defined as a dimension of ideational organizations (Type C).

Finally, developmental-innovation planning is planning which includes high autonomy over means and ends and at the same time attempts to create and legitimize new institutional arrangements in the social system. This is suggestive of the planning behavior one would anticipate in solidary organizations (Type D).

Extending organizational decision-making into an interorganizational field, Warren (1967) identifies four interorganizational decision contexts. In the unitary context, the locus of decision-making occurs within a single structure such that the policies of all subunits are determined by the decision center. For example, a city health department may set the policies for all of the various health and welfare bureaus composing the department.

In a federative context, inclusive decision-making occurs within a formal interorganization employing a staff, but ultimate authority still lies at the level of the individual organization. For instance, a council of churches, or an employer's collective bargaining council, or the United Nations organization exemplifies this interorganizational decision context.

In the social-choice decision context, individuals and community organizations relate on particular issues without a necessary commitment to an external leadership or formal decision structure. Finally, the coalitional decision context is illustrated by a loose interactional structure in which organizational collaboration is on an informal and *ad hoc* basis and emphasizes persuasive tactics to facilitate cooperation. Figure 3 shows how each of these interorganizational contexts dovetail with the four synthetic types of organizations.

Baldridge (167-ff.) has identified four types of conflict issues. The ice-berg phenomenon occurs when the apparent issue is not the real cause of the conflict. This is the type of conflict which would be anticipated in utilitarian organizations (Type A) in which conflicts arising from the formal structural arrangements are translated into demands for greater monetary rewards.

The unifying effect is the type of conflict initiated to unite diverse groups, often in the form of an in-group, out-group definition. This type of conflict is generally used to create and/or strengthen loyalty and allegiance to political organizations.

The sacred issue is a type of conflict involving moral overtones to justify and legitimize conflict actions. As such, it is highly typical of ideational organizations (Type C). Finally, conflict resulting from rising expectations occurs when improvements and concessions tend to provoke new conflicts. This is the type of conflict which would be anticipated as arising from planning

strategies such as the previously discussed, disjointed incrementalism, and as such is reflective of issues occurring in solidary organizations (Type D).

The issue of modal types of participants in these synthetic organizations is slightly more complex. The relevant literature contains single designations, such as economic man,[9] organizational man (White, 1956), political man (Lipset, 1960), bureaucratic man (Kohn, 1971), professional man (Cf., Vollmer and Mills, 1966), and a true-believer (Hoffer, 1951). There are dychotomies, e.g., bureaucrat and enthusiast (Roche and Sachs, 1969), bureaucrat and professional (Blau and Scott:60-ff.), local and cosmopolitan (Gouldner, 1957); trichotomies, e.g., facts-and-figure men, contact men, and communication specialists (Wilensky, 1967), inner-directed, other-directed, and traditional directed (Riesman, 1950); quartratomies, e.g., officials, activists, attentives, and apathetics (Baldridge:177-178); and pentatomies, e.g., officials-climbers, officials-conservers, zealots, advocates, and statesmen (Downs, 1967:88).

Although there is no single four fold typology of modal personality types which is in wide use, the above classifications do suggest a similar underlying pattern closely approximating the requirements of the four synthetic organizations. For instance, participants in Type A organizations (utilitarian) might include: officials, organizational men, facts-and-figures men, bureaucrats, locals, and inner-directed men. Type B organizations (political) might employ political men, traditional-directed men, contact men, and statesmen. Type C organizations (ideational) seem to be typified by enthusiasts, true-believers, and zealots. And finally, Type D organizational (solidary) participants are characterized as professionals, advocates, internal communication specialists, attentives, cosmopolitan, and other-directed men.[10]

The above characteristics of the four synthetic organizations are seen here as suggestive rather than exhaustive.[11] Figure 3 provides a preliminary basis

for illustrating the four unique organizational patterns which seem to underscore the research and theoretical conceptualization in the field. The potential utilization of this composite typology for interorganizational analysis is discussed in the next section.

INTERORGANIZATIONAL UTILIZATION

Interorganizational analysis has provided alternative perspectives for studying the linkages, networks, exchanges, and conflict relationships between relatively autonomous organizations.[12] One prime use of these four synthetic types of organizations is in providing a framework for systematic analysis of the structural features of diverse types of organizations which operate within an interorganizational network or linkage system. For example, the organizations in a network composed of a utilitarian organization (Type A), a political organization (Type B), and a solidary organization (Type D) can be studied using the same theoretical dimensions (e.g., planning strategies) even though the actual characteristics of the respective organizations are quite diverse.

An alternative use of the synthetic organizations is to develop theoretical statements about the types and direction of linkages which might be predicted for a given network. Evan (1966), for example, asks whether Type B organizations have different types of networks than Type A, C, or D and Aldridge (1971) has hypothesized that different types of organizations use different boundary strategies in conflict situations. Clark and Wilson (1961) suggest that Type A organizations are more likely to cooperate with each other than are Type C organizations, and McCune (1971) has documented that Type B and D organizations are more likely to cooperate on drug programs than Type C and A organizations. Finally, Litwak and Rothman (1970) have hypothesized that linkages between Type A organizations are more likely to be formalistic while linkages between Type D organizations are more likely to approximate primary group linkages. Simulation

models could potentially be developed using the synthetic organizational types to further test these and other statements about linkage systems between diverse organizations.

What is of further interest here is the intraorganizational effects which occur when organizations are required by circumstances to interact within a system of linkages. As a general working hypothesis it is proposed that organizational survival as well as expansion and growth require organizations to adopt salient features of the network organizations. It is assumed that organizational adoptions tend to provide a minimum, or working level, consensus which is necessary for establishing linkages and exchanges.

If a network is composed of very similar types of organizations, the number of adopted features may depend on the degree of conflict and competition between the organizations. In any event, organizational adoptions will probably have little effect on the recipient organizations.

On the other hand, it is hypothesized that networks linking highly diverse organizations (e.g., Type A and Type C organizations), will involve selective adoptions which may be the source for major internal conflicts within the recipient organizations. The dilemma for organizational elite may in fact be the unenviable choice of linking, and hence, adopting features of highly salient network organizations at the cost of increasing internal conflicts. For organizational theorists, changes in the types of internal conflicts may serve as important indicators of the types of changes occurring within the interorganizational network. Conversely, changes within an interorganizational network should provide important clues to the types of structural changes and conflicts which may occur within the network organizations. Again, the four synthetic organizational types can be utilized as a theoretical standard for comparing changes occurring within diverse organizations.

This line of reasoning suggests one further point. The synthetic types of organizations, even if artificially created as in a laboratory simulation, probably could not survive when required by circumstances to establish linkages with diverse types of organizations. In this regard, the synthetic organizations may stand in the same relationship to concrete organizations as pure-bred plants stand to hybrid plants. In both instances, survival deficiency does not exist within the units *per se*, but in the changing demands placed upon the units by the larger environment. Organizational survival and expansion may require the adoption of what may seem to be highly incongruent features--at least on the basis of formal theory, yet such features may point to important network linkages which help to account for survival and growth.

Empirically, it is anticipated that every concrete, on-going organization will necessarily have structural features which are incongruent with its general classification as defined by the dimensions of the synthetic organizations. These incongruencies need to be used as indicators for: (1) the types and intensities of internal conflicts, and (2) the types and direction of network linkages which organizations are maintaining, developing, or eliminating. To do this with any theoretical certainty would require a more extensive development of the synthetic organizational types, more empirical testing of theoretical typologies, and better conceptualizations of interorganizational relationships.

END NOTES

1. In deference to critics pointing to the incorrect usage of ideal types (Cf., Lopreato and Alston, 1970), the term "synthetic" is used to label the four types of organizations resulting from the composite typology.
2. Katz and Kahn's (1966) four fold typology of organizations is a direct variant of Parson's typology, hence, it will not be discussed here.
3. All polity organizations, unlike the other three organizational types, have coercion as the source of ultimate control as can be seen in the legitimate taking of life and/or property. Etzioni's examples of coercive organizations are merely the more overt types of polity organizations.
4. This re-interpretation of Thompson's work does little to harm his highly informative analysis. As an administrative theorist, his concern is not with charismatic social movements. In fact, he devotes only three lines to inspirational decision strategy (1967:135). It will be shown later that judgmental decision strategy, as re-interpreted here, is consistent with Braybrooke and Lindblom's (1963) "disjointed incrementalism" and with what Max Weber (1947:115) had earlier pointed to as a type of rationalism in which means are evaluated without regard to ends.
5. These four social control tactics are similar to Caplow's (1964:326-328) four fold typology of organizational conflict variables which he discusses as: subjugation, violence, insulation, and attrition.
6. Aldrich's discussion subsumes these tactics in a more abstract framework interpreted in terms of boundary expansion and contraction strategies. His analysis, however, serves as a highly suggestive line of inquiry.
7. It is not always clear when such tactics represent purely defensive or offensive organizational strategies. In an on-going conflict situation, a specific tactic may alternately serve both purposes.

8. It would lead us astray to develop this point more fully. Suffice it to say that the type of political planning decision described by Braybrooke and Lindblom always require the political elite to justify this type of decision on the basis of a past social-political tradition.

9. The term "man" is used in the generic sense and should be interpreted as any organizational participant regardless of sex.

10. A more refined analysis would require distinguishing between organizational elites and lower level participants.

11. For instance, additional four fold typologies include: Carlson's (1964) typology of organization-client relationships; Emery and Trist's (1965) typology of environmental contexts; Bowers and Seashore (1966) typology of organizational leadership; Mancur Olsen's (1968) implicit typology of collective action; and Perrow's (1967) typology of task structures.

12. For relevant literature reviews, see: Marrett (1971) and Hall (1972: 297-324). Selected empirical studies appear in Heydebrand (1973).

Figure 1

Preliminary Construction of a Composite Organizational Typology
Utilizing Parsons (1956) and Blau and Scott (1962)
Classifications

Benefits	Ownership: Close	Ownership: General
Extrinsic	Type A Economy Organizations Business Concerns Adaptive	Type B Polity Organizations Commonweal Organizations Goal-Attainment
Intrinsic	Type C Cultural Organizations Mutual Benefit Organizations Pattern-Maintenance	Type D Societal Organizations Service Organizations Integrative

Figure 2

A Composite Typology Illustraing Four Synthetic Organizations as Derived from Parsons (1956), Blau and Scott (1962), Etzioni (1961), and Thompson and Tuden (1959)

Type A: Utilitarian	Type B: Political
Economy Organizations	Polity Organizations
Business Concerns	Commonweal Organizations
Utilitarian Organizations	Coercive Organizations
Computational Strategy Orgs.	Compromise Strategy Orgs.
Type C: Ideational	**Type D: Solidary**
Cultural Organizations	Societal Organizations
Mutual Benefit Organizations	Service Organizations
Normative Organizations$_1$	Normative Organizations$_2$
Inspirational Strategy Orgs.	Judgemental Strategy Orgs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 3

Selected Dimensions of the Four Synthetic Organizations Based on Existent Organizational Typologies[1]

Type A Utilitarian Organizations	Type B Political Organizations
Type C Ideational Organizations	Type D Solidary Organizations

Organization Type A: Utilitarian

Societal Contribution: Adaptive
Prime Beneficiary: Owners
Involvement: Calculative
Incentives: Material/Monetary
Decision Strategy: Computational
Base of Power: Bureaucratic Authority
Control Tactics: Cooptation
Planning Strategy: Rational Comprehensive
Decision Base: Means/Ends Calculation
Planning Behavior: Adaptive-Allocation
Interorganizational Context: Unity
Conflict Issue: Ice-berg Phenomenon
Participants: Economic Men
Organization Men
Facts-and-figure Men
Inner-directed Men

Organization Type B: Political

Societal Contribution: Goal Attainment
Prime Beneficiary: Public-At-Large
Involvement: Alienative
Incentives: Coercion
Decision Strategy: Zero-Sum Bargaining
Base of Power: Coercion/Force
Control Tactics: Sanctions/Force
Planning Strategy: Revolutionary & Utopian
Decision Base: Tradition
Planning Behavior: Developmental-Allocation
Interorganizational Context: Federative
Conflict Issue: Unifying Effect
Participants: Political Men
Statesmans
Contact Men
Traditional Directed Men

Organization Type C: Ideational

Societal Contribution: Pattern-Maint.
Prime Beneficiary: Members
Involvement: Moral-Ideological
Incentives: Ideological/Symbolic
Decision Strategy: Inspirational
Base of Power: Personal (Charismatic)
Control Tactics: Insulation
Planning Strategy: Grand Opportunities
Decision Base: Emotion
Planning Behavior: Adaptive-Innovation
Interorganizational Context: Social Choice
Conflict Issue: Sacred Issue
Participants: Enthusiasts
Zealots
Missionaries
True-Believers

Organization Type D: Solidary

Societal Contribution: Integration
Prime Beneficiary: Clients
Involvement: Moral-Social
Incentives: Social
Decision Strategy: Judgemental
Base of Power: Expertise
Control Tactics: Persuasion
Planning Strategy: Disjointed Incrementalism
Decision Base: Means/Ends evaluated Independently
Planning Behavior: Developmental-Innovation
Interorganizational Context: Coalition
Conflict Issue: Rising Expectations
Participants: Professionals
Advocates
Internal Communication Specialists
Other-Directed Men

[1]See text for specific references.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, Howard
1971 "Organizational boundaries and inter-organizational conflict," Human Relations 24(August):279-293.

Bailey, Kenneth D.
1973 "Constructing monothetic and polythetic typologies by the heuristic method." The Sociological Quarterly 14(Summer): 291-308.

Baldridge, J. Victor
1971 Power and Conflict in the University: Research in the Sociology of Complex Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bittner, Egon
1969 "Radicalism and the organization of radical movements." Pp. 290-310 in Barry McLaughlin (ed.), Studies in Social Movements. New York: The Free Press.

Blake, Judith and Kingsley Davis
1964 "Norms, values and sanctions." Pp. 456-484 in R.E.L. Faris (ed.), Handbook of Modern Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott
1962 Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Bowers, David G. and Stanley E. Seashore
1966 "Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership." Administrative Science Quarterly 11 (September):238-263.

Braybrooke, David and Charles E. Lindblom
1963 A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process. New York: The Free Press.

Burns, Tom
1967 "The comparative study of organizations." Pp. 113-170 in Victor H. Vroom (ed.), Methods of Organizational Research. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Caplow, Theodore
1964 Principles of Organization. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Carlson, Richard O.
1964 "Environmental constraints and organizational consequences: the public school and its clients." Pp. 262-276 in Daniel E. Griffiths (ed.), Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Clark, Peter B. and James Q. Wilson
1961 "Incentive systems." Administrative Science Quarterly 6(September): 129-166.

Downs, Anthony
1967 Inside Bureaucracy. Boston; Little, Brown and Company.

Emery, F. E. and E. L. Trist
1965 "The causal texture of organizational environments." Human Relations 18(February):21-32.

Etzioni, Amitai
1961 A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press.

Evan, William M.
1966 "The organization-set: toward a theory of interorganizational relations." Pp. 173-191 in James D. Thompson (ed.), Approaches to Organizational Design. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Friedmann, John
1967 "A conceptual model for the analysis of planning behavior." Administrative Science Quarterly 12(September):225-252.

Gamson, William
1968 Power and Discontent. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Gouldner, Alvin W.
1957 "Cosmopolitans and locals: toward an analysis of latent social roles." Administrative Science Quarterly (December):281-292.

Hall, Richard H. *et al.*
1967 "An examination of the Blau-Scott and Etzioni typologies." Administrative Science Quarterly 12(June):118-139.

Hall, Richard H.
1972 Organizations: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Heydebrand, Wolf V.
1973 Comparative Organizations: The Results of Empirical Research. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hoffer, Eric
1951 The True Believer. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn
1966 The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Krueckeberg, Donald A.
1971 "Variations in behavior of planning agencies." Administrative Science Quarterly 16(June):192-202.

Kohn, Melvin L.
1971 "Bureaucratic man: a portrait and an interpretation." American Sociological Review 36(June):461-474.

Lipset, Seymour M.
1960 Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics. New York: Anchor Books.

Litterer, Joseph A.
1973 The Analysis of Organizations (Second Edition). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Litwak, Eugene and Jack Rothman
1970 "Towards the theory and practice of coordination between formal organizations." Pp. 137-186 in William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton (eds.), Organizations and Clients. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Lopreato, Joseph and Letitia Alston
1970 "Ideal types and the idealization strategy." American Sociological Review 35(February):88-96.

Marrett, Cora Bagley
1971 "On the specification of interorganizational dimensions." Sociology and Social Research 56(October):83-99.

McCune, Donald Allan
1971 "An analysis of interorganizational cooperation in drug abuse program." Unpublished Dissertation. Stanford University.

Meeker, B. F.
1971 "Decisions and exchange." American Sociological Review 36(June): 485-495.

Olsen, Mancur
1968 The Logic of Collective Action. New York: Schocken Books.

Parsons, Talcott
1956 "Suggestions for a sociological approach to the theory of organizations." Administrative Science Quarterly 1(June):63-85, (September):225-239.

Perrow, Charles
1967 "A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations." American Sociological Review 32(April):194-208.

Riesman, David
1950 The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Roche, John P. and Stephen Sachs
1969 "The bureaucrat and the enthusiast: an exploration of the leadership of social movements." Pp. 207-222 in Barry McLaughlin (ed.), Studies in Social Movements. New York: Free Press.

Thompson, James D. and Arthur Tuden
1959 "Strategies, structures and processes of organizational decision." Pp. 195-216 in James D. Thompson, *et al.* (eds.), Comparative Studies in Administration. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press.

Thompson, James D.
1967 Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Vollmer, Howard M. and Donald L. Mills (eds.)
1966 Professionalization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Warren, Roland L.
1967 "The interorganizational field as a focus for investigation." Administrative Science Quarterly 12(December):397-419.

Weber, Max
1947 The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (trans.), and Talcott Parsons (ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Weldon, Peter D.
1972 "An examination of the Blau-Scott and Etzioni typologies: a critique." Administrative Science Quarterly 17(March):76-78.

White, William H., Jr.
1956 The Organization Man. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Wilensky, Harold L.
1967 Organizational Intelligence: Knowledge and Policy in Government and Industry. New York: Basic Books, Inc.